

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed 13 July 2004, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 15-20 and 22-24 stand rejected.

Rejection under 35 USC 112:

Claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations of "said video decompression means," "said video receiving means," and "said video image out means."

Responsive to the Examiner's remarks, applicants have amended the indicated claims to provide a proper antecedent basis for the indicated limitations.

Claims 8 and 11 are similarly rejected in view of the alleged insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations "said encoding circuit" and "said decoding circuit." Applicant has amended the aforesaid claims to provide proper antecedent basis for the indicated limitations.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12 and 14-20 are rejected in view of their dependency from one of the previously mentioned claims which serves as a respective base claim. In view of the amendments to claims 1, 8, and 11, applicants respectfully submit that the basis of the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 112 has been obviated. Further, the claims dependent on claims 1, 8 and 11, namely claims 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 14-20 should also now be allowable in view of the present allowability of their respective base claims.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the provision of proper antecedent basis where required by the Examiner, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Applicant's alleged disclosure in view of Palmer et al. Further, Claims, 11-12, 14-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under

35 USC 102(a) over Applicant's alleged disclosure in view of Palmer and Gould.

In paragraph 6 of his Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 7, 16 and 20 would be allowable provided that these claims were rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to the indication of the Examiner, applicant has amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of Claim 5, 6, and 7. In essence, claim 1, as amended, is claim 7, rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim (claim 1) and all of the limitations of any intervening claim (claims 5 and 6).

Similarly, applicant has amended claim 11 to include all of the limitations of claims 15 and 16. It follows that claim 11, as amended, is in essence, claim 16 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim (claim 11) and all intervening claims (claim 15).

Finally, claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim (claim 11). There were no intervening claims between claim 20 and its base claim.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 11 and 20 and the comments of the Examiner, applicants respectfully submit that these claims should now be in allowable form.

Since the remaining claims of the application, namely claims 2, 4, 8-12, 14 and 18-19, depend either directly or indirectly from either claim 1 or claim 11, applicants respectfully submit that each of these remaining claims should also be allowable in view of their dependency from an allowable claim and furthermore in view of the respective recitation of additional limitations in each claim.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laurence B. Bond', written in a cursive style.

Laurence B. Bond
Registration No. 30, 549
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 27, 2005
LBB/dh

N:\2862\3750.1\amendment after request.doc